Local plagiarisms

Borg, E.

Original citation & hyperlink:
Borg, E. (2009) Local plagiarisms. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, volume 34 (4): 415-426
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602930802075115

Local plagiarisms

Erik Borg
Centre for Academic Writing, Coventry University

Abstract

Plagiarism and collusion are significant issues for most lecturers whatever their discipline, and to universities and the higher education sector. Universities respond to these issues by developing institutional definitions of plagiarism, which are intended to apply to all instances of plagiarism and collusion. This article first suggests that plagiarism and collusion are related instances of the desirable phenomenon of intertextuality, but which are defined as transgressive, that is, intertextuality that crosses a boundary defining relationships that are inappropriate in a specific context. The article then goes on to show, through interviews with lecturers in a variety of disciplines, that lecturers' interpretations of inappropriate or transgressive intertextuality vary for reasons including the expectations and practices of the discipline. The article suggests that transgressive intertextuality needs to be defined according to the disciplinary expectations and that a single institutional definition may be inadequate to defining varying disciplinary perspectives.

Introduction

The issues of plagiarism and collusion can seem to unite academics across the tribal and territorial boundaries (Becher & Trowler, 2001) that commonly separate them in ways that few other issues can. Most lecturers have had experience of these forms of academic misconduct or suspected them, and most are concerned at how to address them (Park, 2003). In turn, universities generate statements that define academic misconduct in order both to limit this and also to prescribe how suspected incidents will be dealt with and what penalties should be invoked.

However, the onus of initially identifying possible incidents of misconduct, and assessing the seriousness of the incident remains with the lecturer. As Flint, Clegg and Macdonald say, "all instances of plagiarism are mediated by [lecturers' internalized definitions of plagiarism] *before* consulting policy" (2006, p. 152; emphasis in original). This study was undertaken in order to explore how the experiences of lecturers informed their thinking about plagiarism and collusion in order better to teach academic writing to international students. One of the themes to emerge from interviews undertaken to explore these experiences was that lecturers' disciplines informed and altered their approaches to plagiarism and collusion, which are described here as transgressive intertextuality.

The fact that universities define academic misconduct and that lecturers are almost universally united in being concerned about the issue does not mean that plagiarism and collusion are simple to define or uncontroversial. For example, by using interviews Chandrasoma, Thompson and Pennycook (2004) were able to investigate students' stances toward plagiarism and collusion. They identified five areas that were problematic, that is, areas in which students' use of sources might be seen either as inappropriate or not depending on the perspective of the observer. These areas included: patchwriting (Howard, 1999); students' identities as academic authors; their lack of shared understanding of "common knowledge"; information that is received through so many outlets that its source is difficult to identify, and the conflicting demands of interdisciplinary programmes. Studies of lecturers have suggested that they do not have an uncomplicated view of plagiarism and collusion. Two studies that employed quantitative approaches find differences among lecturers. Roig (2001) used an experimental methodology (previously used with students) to suggest that the paraphrasing practices of lecturers varied, with a significant proportion paraphrasing in ways that might be considered plagiarism. Using the institutional definition for plagiarism and collusion, Pickard (2006) surveyed lecturers on their beliefs about the extent of academic misconduct and how they addressed those incidents that they identified. She found significant variation in the number of incidents reported and in the steps taken to address plagiarism, ranging from warnings given to the initiation of formal, second-stage procedures.

Studies using qualitative, generally interview, methodologies elicit more detail about the variation found among lecturers. Interviewing lecturers who teach writing to international students, Sutherland-Smith (2005) found that attitudes toward plagiarism differ substantially even among academics who work in the same area. She identified seven areas, ranging from divisions on the role of intention in plagiarism to an expressed opinion that the university valued research rather than the pursuit of plagiarism, that affected lecturers' approaches to plagiarism. Flint, Clegg and Macdonald (2006) interviewed lecturers to find how they addressed plagiarism. They found different ways of conceptualising the relationship between plagiarism and cheating, with some lecturers seeing these concepts as identical, while others describe them as discreet activities, while still others say that they overlap or believe that plagiarism is a subcategory—but not the only one—of cheating. Not all lecturers in their study believed collusion was a form of plagiarism, and many felt the boundary between collaboration and collusion was not clearly marked. Flint, Clegg and Macdonald note that in their study variation in approach to plagiarism "is not linked to disciplinary context but more tied to individual, personal interpretations and understandings" (p. 148).

Collusion is less frequently studied empirically than plagiarism, though Lunsford and her collaborators (Lunsford, 1993, Lunsford, 1996, Lunsford & Ede, 1994, Lunsford & West, 1996) have argued extensively that students' written knowledge should be acknowledged as socially constructed. They claim that this is more consonant with workplace and academic professional practice than traditional individualist understandings of intellectual property, and that this view of writing has implications for teaching. Lunsford and Ede argue for the need for pedagogy to move from "collaboration to collaborative *writing*" (p.

438; emphasis in the original). Their position differs from the model of academic achievement embodied in the UK's Research Assessment Exercise[1] that values single author publication above other forms of output (Larkham & Manns, 2002).

Among empirical studies, Barrett and Cox (2005) used a scenario-based questionnaire to investigate both plagiarism and collusion. They found that, given brief definitions of plagiarism and collusion, both lecturers and students could identify most of the scenarios that described acceptable practices, collusion or plagiarism. However, they found that the scenarios illustrating collusion were "the most debatable and these produced the highest level of no response" (p. 117). They interpreted this finding in relation to free comments that they elicited suggesting that collusion was both less clearly circumscribed than plagiarism, and that it might have redeeming qualities (the phrase, "at least they're learning something," in their title is taken from one of these responses) absent in plagiarism.

Transgressive intertextuality

As Clegg and Flint (2006) note, discussions of plagiarism frequently take place in an atmosphere of moral panic and condemnation. This can make studies of lecturers' practices difficult. In order to facilitate a more measured discussion, I would like to focus on the concept of intertextuality. Intertextuality (Kristeva, 1980) is a feature of language, because language is socially constructed. Our words are learned from others, and then appropriated for our own purposes; we enter into dialogue when we speak and write, and our language and ideas are reshaped in contact with other people. This happens at the level of specific language—when we adopt slang, regional variants or professional jargon—and at higher levels, such as beliefs, rationalisations and concepts, all of which are embodied in language.

While all language has ways of indicating, "she said… I heard…," academic writing is characterised by explicit intertextuality, which is something that lecturers have learned and that students need to be taught. Ideas and specific language must be referred to others in conventionalised ways (e.g., Harvard or numeric citation systems) that are different from writing in other contexts. Learning explicit intertextuality is a part of disciplinary acculturation.

In contrast with appropriate intertextuality, transgressive intertextuality describes the situated understanding of inappropriate intertextuality. The concept of transgressive intertextuality (TI) unites both plagiarism and collusion. This term is not proposed to take the "sting" out of academic misconduct. Students who turn in assignments as their own that they have not written commit an offence against themselves, their lecturers, their institution, and the educational enterprise. However, transgressive intertextuality shifts the focus of these issues away from "colourful" rhetoric (Park, 2003) that identifies students as language or idea kidnappers who are others, utterly separate from good

[1] The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is an assessment by the funding bodies of UK higher education institutions to evaluate the quality of research produced within these institutions in order to allocate research funding (Research Assessment Exercise, no date).

scholars or even ordinary students. Instead, TI reframes these issues as one of textual relations—whether spoken or written—that can be challenging to all students and even to academics.

For example, it is generally understood that "common knowledge" does not need to be cited. In a university that is internationalising its curriculum, identifying common knowledge is not simple, and, as Chandrasoma, Thompson and Pennycook (2004) note, interdisciplinary programmes and media-generated information further complicate the identification of boundaries and sources of common knowledge. A number of studies, unrelated to plagiarism or collusion, have identified disciplinary differences in areas related to intertextuality. Among these are Hyland's (1999) study of citation practices and North's (2005) study, which showed that students' evaluation of sources varying according to disciplinary background. North found that "undergraduate writing reflects social and epistemological differences between disciplines and suggest[s] that communication skills may be context-specific" (2005, p. 518). As this study developed, it emerged that there were other areas besides those mentioned in which the boundary of appropriate intertextuality was contested. Transgressive intertextuality therefore is intended to provide a way to explore the contextual boundaries that exist in academic practice with as few preconceptions as possible.

Methodology

This study on which this article is based was intended to inform the teaching of academic writing to international students. It explored the experiences of lecturers in a post-1992 British university[2] in identifying plagiarism and collusion, and their responses and reactions to these, including their experiences of dealing with institutional procedures if they had used them. Initially, lecturers who were course leaders were contacted to find participants in rough proportion to the different faculties of the university. Although a few lecturers who were contacted were not currently teaching and were not included, no one contacted declined to be interviewed. As the study evolved and theories developed, participants whose experiences might contradict these theories were sought, in a process of purposive sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994, Robson, 2002) in which disconfirming cases were sought. Ultimately, twenty-four lecturers were interviewed either in their offices or at a place they suggested for a half-hour up to an hour and a half, using a semi-structured interview format (see appendix below). This is a relatively small number of participants from a university with nearly a thousand academics; participants from the five faculties comprising the university ranged from three each in three faculties to seven in Engineering, Science and Technology and eight in the Faculty of the Arts. This report is intended to provide insights that would contribute to the growing body of flexible design studies of plagiarism, such as those mentioned here (e.g., Clegg & Flint, 2006; Sutherland-Smith, 2005) and provide a base for wider, fixed design studies.

The researcher knew none of the participants before contacting them, though the interviews invoked a shared professional fellowship, and their thoughts reported here

[2] In 1992, polytechnics were allowed to identify themselves as universities and grant their own degrees (Pratt, 1997).

would probably have been expressed differently in their discussions of these issues with students. Interviews were transcribed, coded and analysed using the NVivo software package, based both on the planned research questions and developing themes (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). The use of qualitative data analysis software allowed the identification and coding of significant themes, and the inspection of the data within their original context. Among other goals, this return to the contextualised data sought to insure that the themes identified represented the participants' reiterated concerns. Among the themes that emerged was disciplinary variation in the interpretation of transgressive intertextuality.

Findings

Personal experience affected lecturers' perceptions of transgressive intertextuality. This is consonant with Flint, Clegg and Macdonald's (2006) findings. Interview participants had thought extensively about these issues; several had taken students through the university disciplinary process. Some had altered their assessment procedures in order to reduce cheating; others expressed their anger and frustration at discovering this misconduct. Lecturers also expressed empathy for students whose academic work, they thought, suffered from the need to hold a job; several mentioned the ending of grants and the introduction of top-up fees:

> You know I would never have a degree if I thought I was going to have twenty, five or ten thousand in debt…. This student, who may have copied for very good reasons, you know, they may have worked all weekend, at work, and you know, where you've, they've had too many things to do, just mistimed it all, so they copied one of them, you know, it happens, shouldn't really be punished that much….

Beyond the variations of personal responses to plagiarism and collusion, however, there were significant variations that stem from disciplinary expectations. These variations illuminate the different discourse communities as much as they threw light on issues of academic misconduct. This study considers these varying disciplinary responses to plagiarism and collusion, and these responses are the focus of the remainder of this paper.

Humanities

Early in the study, a lecturer in the humanities offered a prototypical description of TI:

> We would deem it to be plagiarism if there were substantial passages, if there were whole sentences that were directly taken, reproduced. So we have, if you like, minor cases where a student has used, you know, on a given page they're clearly following a structure or an argument in the presentation of information that they've found in a given source and, you know, without adapting it significantly. On the whole the writing is to some extent their own but there are passages that are directly lifted. That's a relatively mild case. A completely hopeless case is where virtually the entire page is, you know, directly lifted.

This description matches fairly closely the university's official definition of plagiarism, "The unacknowledged incorporation in a student's work of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another." Of the lecturers interviewed, only one referred to the official description when asked to describe plagiarism or collusion. The rest offered their own interpretations of these concepts, which frequently showed the influence of their disciplinary contexts.

History

For example, in history the perspective on TI shifts somewhat. Practicing historians and students shared a continuum of intertextual relations:

> For a long time I worked with colleagues in English literature, and indeed still do, and I've found that there is a difference in perception between historians and literary critics, in the sense that literary critics regard any kind of copying as an ultimate sin. Historians recognise that to a certain extent whatever students are doing, they are going to be repeating material, reorganising material that they found from elsewhere, as indeed practising historians do, …but we also recognise a lot of the time we are using other peoples' work, and, for that reason, again, we tend not to regard it with such a severe eye.

This lecturer went on to say that, based on his experience, his colleagues in English were looking for a personal response to a text, "whereas a historian is fully aware that students are going to have to use textbooks, monographs, anything" that would lie between them and the primary sources of history. "The key thing is that they should make use of [these secondary sources] rather than simply repeating [them]. But to a certain extent there is an element of repetition in that as well." This historian's reflections on intertextuality might provide insights into the accusations of plagiarism against well-known historians such as Stephen Ambrose and Doris Kerns Goodwin, both of whom wrote texts based on other scholars' primary research (Kirkpatrick, 2002a, Kirkpatrick, 2002b).

The writer who is learning to think like a historian needs to become an evaluator and synthesiser. In these roles, explicit and appropriate intertextuality are required. But the student writer is not interpreting and reacting to a work with artistic claims—literature, film, etc. Instead, they are learning to evaluate existing narratives. In the first case, the boundary of personal response should be evident to the writer—and made so to the reader—while the historian (in training) must make judgements and construct a narrative from existing narratives, and the possibility of transgressing the boundary of the ownership of the ideas may be less clear.

Language study

At the university where this study took place, there are English-speaking students who are studying courses that combine a discipline (for example, business) and a European language, and students, predominantly from continental Europe, who are studying the

English language, as well as content in English. For these students, as well as those students just beginning language study, the domain of TI is substantial. In the early stages of language study, the relevant precedent text for thinking about intertextuality is the entirety of native-speaker communicative competence: choices of tense, determiners, idioms, and register. Even at more advanced levels of study, communicative competence is the sum of all the contacts with text—oral and written—that informs that competence, separating the fluent language user from the intermediate student.

For the language teacher, the perspective on TI is quite different from that in the view of the teacher in the field of humanities or history. Since there may be in one classroom students who are learning a language with the concomitant direct translations and unidiomatic phrasings, and native-speaking students of the same language for whom each choice is self-evident, these students could work together, creating intertextual relationships across languages, and enrich the language learning process. The language lecturer who participated in this study acknowledged there was a risk that collaboration might cross over to a boundary to become collusion, a form of TI, but he felt this intertextual relationship could be managed and TI defined:

> We have another notice that we put up each year for any students who are doing language essays, whether they be foreign language, or foreign students doing English essays, which is we do encourage them to use visiting students as a resource. …but what we do not permit them to do is permit the students with whom they want to discuss their work, to actually correct it for them. We permit them to make a list of the sort of grammar areas, or areas of language competence where the person who's read the essay for them, or piece of work for them, the translation or whatever, would say, "Well, actually, if I were you, I'd concentrate on the following in quality of language or use of idiom, agreements, use of articles, whatever it might be." But we do not permit them to correct it.

This lecturer may overestimate the ability of students to apply guidelines that might challenge language teaching professionals, but he recognises the value of collaboration in written projects as well as in the students' oral practice.

Engineering

In engineering, a professional ethos of large, shared projects leads to lecturers who encourage students to work together. For engineering,

> …it's all groups, they've got to work, so that in a way is setting the group scenario going. You find that when they then start to do maths, etc., etc., they work as groups as well. Because some will understand some works and… it's natural, isn't it, you know, in the university go for a cup of tea, and lots of them do work in the cafeteria, people doing stuff, work together, you'd expect, somebody's in a bit of a hurry, I didn't understand what was going on, it's much easier to ask a colleague than an academic. First of all the colleague is sitting next to you, says, "Oh, that was easy, man." Whereas the academic has to be

> found, time has to be set aside. So, you know, the whole university process should be working together in a way, using each other to help as a first line of reference, and some of it is deliberately set, and it just continues.

And, from another lecturer in engineering:

> But, you know, we say in Built Environment, "Buildings are too big to be the work of one person, you have to learn to work with other people," you know…

Collusion seems not to be a part of TI in engineering as collaboration is required on some assignments and anticipated for other assessments. However, because the form of authorship assumed by institutions, including universities through their regulation of TI, is based on the idea of a singular author, collaboration may be problematic outside the discipline. Lunsford (1996) notes the problems that collaborative knowledge creation in the sciences causes, describing a variety of attempts by scientists to credit laboratories or teams of scientists, and the institutional pressures, for example, from abstracting journals, that work to vitiate these attempts and re-establish the singular (or lead) author.

Law

In contrast to engineering, in law courses, for certain significant course work, there is an emphasis on individual work. Because this attitude to TI was so strikingly different from that anticipated, additional interviews were undertaken to try to establish if this was an idiosyncratic approach of one participant. However, additional participants confirmed the initial interview, and both the participants in this study and published reports (e.g., LeClercq, 1999) describe this as different from legal practice. LeClercq suggests that this emphasis on individual work reflects an attempt to instil a mindset, rather than a workplace practice. Here is how a lecturer in law described her approach:

> I had this student come to see me. This is a third year student who'd just been doing conveyancing coursework. He came in to ask me some questions about the coursework, which is fair enough, so we were talking about those and he said, "Oh, I've been talking to my friends about this one," "You're not allowed to discuss it with your friends. That's collusion. If I think you've been colluding, I'm going to have to fail you. So, don't discuss it with your friends." He said, "Oh, but it's not really collusion, that. You know, I'm just talking about it with my friends." "If you're talking about the coursework, it is collusion. You've got to stop it." And he, he seemed surprised that he wasn't allowed to do that.

For this lecturer, and other lecturers in law, TI occurred when students discussed their written assignments with other students. Further discussion with this lecturer elicited her feeling that, though she was not entirely comfortable with this rule, she understood the need for it. Much of the work at this level was both routine and critical. There was only one correct solution to the task, and each student had to demonstrate that they could—individually—find that solution. Discussion, as much as "plagiarism," undermined that demonstration, and so was defined as TI.

LeClercq (1999) emphasises how different the practices of law school are from the workplace practice of law in regard to intertextuality, calling it a "cataclysmal shift" (p. 250), affecting both the use of others' written texts and the ways that ideas and texts are generated. "While collaboration is an acknowledged, accepted, and required way of working" in law practice (p. 247), students should not be expected to intuit the differences in expectation between the academy and the workplace. For LeClercq, as long as these differences are carefully articulated, variation may be appropriate for different assessment tasks, but the needs, and therefore the boundaries may be different from those set by the university as a whole.

Fashion

Transgressive intertextuality in fashion design is startlingly different from that of other disciplines described. Early in the study, a lecturer in fashion design said that it wouldn't be worth my time talking with her, as she had no problems with plagiarism or collusion. After a few interviews suggested that hers was an unusual experience, I again asked her to discuss her perspective. She carefully bracketed our discussion by saying that she and other lecturers in design distinguished between written texts and the clothing designs that she assigned and assessed. Other lecturers assigned writing tasks, while her assignments were all practical. In their written assignments, students were held to standards similar to those expressed by the lecturer in the humanities. However, in the practice of fashion design,

> Right from the beginning, we set out in our guidance unit, that, that copying, borrowing, stealing, whatever you want to call it, is an accepted practice that's part of the business, used responsibly, and should be used responsibly by them… We've never had problems of students copying so literally that we have had to draw a line under it. … Students also, by their very nature, want to stand for what they do with their own identity. Therefore, we have never had a case, as far as I know, where a student hasn't worked to do that and has completely ripped something off.

Fashion design is relevant to a study of intertextuality in at least three ways: First, like the essays that these students also have to write, clothing design is an assessed task; second, from a semiotic perspective, clothing design has meaning and can be evaluated for meeting an assignment brief, and, third, in the workplace, designers of clothing have been accused of plagiarism, so that the concept of plagiarism is realised and understood within the professional as well as the academic discourse community.

Although fashion may be at an edge or limit of practical learning, other areas of the university are near this edge, including design in engineering and computing (e.g., webpage design), and fine arts. Interviews with lecturers in engineering suggested similar attitudes to innovation and plagiarism, though the differences with lecturers in the humanities were less striking. Fashion design invokes a persona—whether athletic, formal or casual—based on a repertoire of existing models (that is, both previously

existing clothing and purposes to which they have been used) within the society. Student designers can be assessed on whether they have successfully created a plausible outfit for a formal occasion in the spring, for example. Students must be aware of—and should refer to—existing currents in fashion outside the classroom.

Second, as Witte (1992) pointed out, meaning-making is multi-modal, involving a variety of symbols and media. As he notes, "studying the production and use of 'writing' from a perspective that privileges spoken or written linguistic systems of meaning-making and ignores other systems of meaning making can hardly yield a comprehensive or culturally viable understanding of 'writing' or 'text'" (240). If text is to be understood multimodally, intertext must also be, and the insights of other meaning-making systems need to be included in an understanding of intertextuality.

Finally, as the fashion design lecturer pointed out, accusations of plagiarism occur within the fashion industry, though because of the nature of the industry few accusations end in public determinations of plagiarism. In a case reported by Horyn (2002), after exposure by an on-line journal, a designer for a major fashion house acknowledged closely copying the work of another designer. Horyn quotes the costume curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, who described the process of design creation as one of "rummaging through extant material culture and juxtaposing it to create something different," a description that resonates with concepts of language as fundamentally intertextual.

One of the striking features of writing for study purposes is that it frequently does not evoke a response, apart from the assessed mark and feedback, which are in some cases received long after the assignment was handed in. This is quite different from most common forms of writing that students are familiar with, such as e-mails and text messages. The most noteworthy feature of the Internet is its interactive nature: blogs and web postings get responses. However, Catt and Gregory (2006), in their study of PGCE students from more than 70 degree programmes, found that only 16 per cent had received formative feedback on their written assignments. Further, because of the need for internal and external marking, even summative feedback came long after the work had been completed. Fashion design, on the other hand, is public and quickly elicits a response.

Limitations and conclusion

There is a tension in describing appropriate intertextuality as varying among disciplines; universities strive for clarity of definition, and transparency and consistency in the handling of possible incidents of transgressive intertextuality. Nevertheless, disciplinary differences divide us profoundly. Having spent years learning and subsequently practising particular ways of knowing, the epistemology and textual practices of our disciplines seem natural, even if they differ from the practices of others. That is the implication of Becher and Trowler's (2001) metaphor of academic tribes. The differences in lecturers' perceptions of appropriate intertextuality go beyond the ebb and flow of personal experiences to the disciplinary "characteristics and structures of the

knowledge domains with which such groups are professionally concerned" (Becher & Trowler, 2001, p. 42). Both assessment and writing are situated practices. Studies of writing (e.g., Hyland, 1999, North, 2005) have shown variation that is related to disciplines and based on underlying epistemological assumptions. This study presents the views of a limited number of academics in a particular institution. The participants' views will have been shaped by their context in a post-1992 university. It is impossible to represent the views of the members of a discipline based on the small group of participants reported here. Academics in each discipline may disagree with the views expressed by the participants.

However, using what Coffey and Atkinson (1996, pp. 155-7) call abductive reasoning, it is possible to situate these data within an explanatory framework. That framework is provided by the variety of studies, exemplified by Becher and Trowler and others cited above, that identify fundamental epistemological differences among disciplines. If these epistemological differences exist, it would not seem surprising that they are replicated in evidencing, generating and presenting new knowledge, and the judgment that, because of TI, texts had failed to demonstrate knowledge. That is an academic's judgment that a text shows evidence of plagiarism or collusion.

Because disciplinary variations are realised in intertextuality, this variation needs to be recognised in policies intended to address plagiarism and collusion. Universities might allow schools or faculties to adopt alternative definitions so long as these encompass the key points of the university's definition. This might allow for transparency and fairness, while at the same time acknowledging disciplinary variation in intertextuality. If variation is not acknowledged, students may receive mixed messages, making the process of reducing TI more difficult.

Lecturers also need to inspect their own understanding of intertextuality (a point also made by Clegg & Flint, 2006) and their expectations and assessment of their students. The example of approaches to intertextuality in fashion might be adapted; as writers such as Lanham (2006) have suggested, the concept of intellectual property evolved alongside print technology. The concept of intellectual property, grounded as it is in physical property, does not fit the Internet; "the Internet models the larger cultural conversation, and when something is put up there, people naturally consider it not as a product but as part of a conversation" (Lanham, 2006, p. 13). Assessment should become more agile so that students can see themselves joining that conversation.

Note: I would like to thank Professor Mike Baynham, who improved this paper, in particular by suggesting the more descriptive term *Transgressive Intertextuality* for my own term *Problematic Intertextuality*. I would also like to thank the editor and referees for advice that improved this paper.

References

Barrett, R. & Cox, A. L. (2005) 'At least they're learning something': The hazy line between collaboration and collusion. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 30(2)**,** 107-122.

Becher, T. & Trowler, P. R. (2001) *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines,* (2nd edn) (Buckingham, UK, SRHE & Open University Press).

Catt, R. & Gregory, G. (2006) The point of writing: Is student writing in higher education developed or merely assessed? in: L. Ganobcsik-Williams (Ed.) *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education: Theories, practices and models.* (Houndsmill, UK, Palgrave Macmillan), 16-29.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C. & Pennycook, A. (2004) Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education,* 3(3)**,** 171-193.

Clegg, S. & Flint, A. (2006) More heat than light: Plagiarism in its appearing. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 27(3)**,** 373-387.

Flint, A., Clegg, S. & Macdonald, R. (2006) Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 30(2)**,** 145-156.

Horyn, C. (2002, 9 April) Is copying really a part of the creative process? *New York Times*.

Howard, R. M. (1999) The new abolitionism comes to plagiarism, in: L. Buranen & A. M. Roy (Eds) *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world.* Albany, NY, State University of New York Press), 87-95.

Hyland, K. (1999) Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics,* 20(3)**,** 341-367.

Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2002a, 11 Jan.) As historian's fame grows, so does attention to sources, *New York Times*, A1, A19.

Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2002b, 23 Feb.) Historian says borrowing was wider than known, *New York Times*.

Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in language,* (L. S. Roudiez, T. Gora & A. Jardine, Trans.) (New York, Columbia University Press).

Lanham, R. A. (2006) *The economics of attention: Style and substance in the age of information,* (Chicago, University of Chicago).

Larkham, P. J. & Manns, S. (2002) Plagiarism and its treatment in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 26(4)**,** 339-349.

Leclercq, T. (1999) Failure to teach: Due process and law school plagiarism. *Journal of Legal Education,* 49(2)**,** 236-255.

Lunsford, A. A. (1993) Intellectual property, concepts of selfhood, and the teaching of writing. *Writing Instructor,* 12(2)**,** 67-77.

Lunsford, A. A. (1996) Intellectual property in an age of information: What is at stake for composition studies? in: L. Z. Bloom, D. A. Daiker & E. M. White (Eds) *Composition in the twenty-first century: Crisis and change.* (Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL, Southern Illinois University Press), 261-272.

Lunsford, A. A. & Ede, L. (1994) Collaborative authorship and the teaching of writing, in: M. Woodmansee & P. Jaszi (Eds) *The construction of authorship: Textual*

appropriation in law and literature. (Durham, NC and London, Duke University Press), 417-438.
Lunsford, A. A. & West, S. (1996) Intellectual property and composition studies. *College Composition and Communication,* 47(3)**,** 383-411.
Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis,* (2nd edn) (Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage).
North, S. (2005) Different values, different skills? A comparison of essay writing by students from arts and science backgrounds. *Studies in Higher Education,* 30(5)**,** 517-533.
Park, C. (2003) In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 28(5)**,** 471-488.
Pickard, J. (2006) Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 31(2)**,** 215-232.
Pratt, J. (1997) *The polytechnic experiment 1965-1992,* (Buckingham, UK, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University).
Research Assessment Exercise (no date) *RAE2008.* Available online at: http://www.rae.ac.uk/ (accessed 12 April 2007).
Robson, C. (2002) *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers,* (2nd edn) (Malden, MA & Oxford, Blackwell).
Roig, M. (2001) Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics and Behavior,* 11(3)**,** 307-323.
Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005) Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 4(1)**,** 83-95.
Witte, S. P. (1992) Context, text, intertext: Toward a constructivist semiotic of writing. *Written Communication,* 9(2)**,** 237-308.

Appendix, interview protocol:

I'm looking at problems of plagiarism and collusion at the university, as seen by teachers.

If you don't mind, can I ask some background question? All of this information will of course remain anonymous, but it'll help me develop the breadth of my interviews.

- What courses are you the course leader for?
- How long have you been course leader, or teaching at UNN?
- How many students does your department teach?
- Do you teach both undergraduate and post-graduate students? How about full and part-time students?

Ideas about plagiarism

If you were to explain plagiarism to a student, what would you say it is?
    What kinds of things would fall under that heading? Could you give me some examples?
    Why do you think students plagiarise?
    Do you think there's anything problematic about the concept of plagiarism?

Teaching plagiarism and referencing

Do you think plagiarism is a problem?
    Do you need more support & help in teaching this area?
Do you think students arrive on your course with adequate understanding of plagiarism and referencing?
    [If so] what are they missing, what do they need to know?
    Do you see this primarily as a mechanical problem or as a conceptual problem?
Does your department teach referencing and avoidance of plagiarism?
    [If so] what does it do? Do you have handouts? Can I get a copy of them?
    What things should be taught? Who should teach them?

Dealing with plagiarism

[If not answered earlier] are you finding cases of plagiarism?
    Has this changed over time?
    Do overseas students have different problems from home students?
    What kinds of plagiarism are you finding? (Internet essay banks?)
    Is collusion a problem?
What happens when you find plagiarism?
    How do you handle it?
    When do you take it through disciplinary procedures?
    Does the university make it too difficult to pursue suspected cases of plagiarism?
    What factors influence you to take it through disciplinary procedures?

Do you know of anyone who has ideas of how to deal with plagiarism or who has had very bad experiences of plagiarism?